REMARKS

By the present Amendment, Applicants cancel claims 2-4, 9-15, and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof and amend claims 1, 5, and 8 to more appropriately claim the invention. More specifically, Applicants incorporate subject matter of claims 2, 3, 4, and 11 thereof into claim 1. As a result of this Amendment, claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 remain pending.

In the final Office Action mailed April 5, 2005, the Examiner rejected claims 1 and 18 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. 6,177,915 to *Beeteson et al.* in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,115,021 to *Nonomura et al.;* claims 2, 8, and 13-15 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Beeteson* in view of *Nonomura* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,121,943 to *Nishioka et al.;* claims 3-6 and 9-11 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Beeteson* in view of *Nonomura* and *Nishioka* and further in view of U.S. Patent No. 3,956,661 to *Sakamoto et al.;* and claim 12 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as unpatentable over *Beeteson* in view of *Nonomura* and *Nishioka* and further in view of *The Electrical Engineering Handbook,* CRC Press, 1993.

Applicants have cancelled claims 2-4, 9-15, and 18 without prejudice or disclaimer of the subject matter thereof thereby rendering the Examiner's Section 103 rejection of claims 2-4, 9-15, and 18 moot.

Applicants respectfully traverse the Section 103 rejections of the present pending claims 1, 5, 6, and 8 and submit that these claims are allowable for at least the following reasons.

To properly establish a *prima facie* case of obviousness, the Examiner must demonstrate that all claim elements are taught or suggested by the prior art cited by the Office. Accordingly, for example, the Examiner must show that the applied references disclose or suggest all the elements recited in amended claim 1.

Amended claim 1 recites, among other things, a "voltage regulation circuit for regulating the voltage level . . . supplied to said liquid crystal display device to a predetermined value . . . wherein said voltage regulation circuit . . . comprise[s] a diode group including a plurality of series-connected diodes connected between said control terminal of said amplifying element and ground wherein said series-connected diodes comprises an anode terminal connected to said control terminal of said amplifying element and a cathode terminal connected to the ground." (*Emphasis added).* The applied references fail to teach or suggest at least these limitations.

The Examiner acknowledges that "neither *Beeteson, Nonomura,* nor *Nishioka* teach that the voltage regulation circuit comprises a diode group" (*See* Office Action, p. 7). Nevertheless, the examiner contends that such teachings are shown in Figs. 1 and 2 and corresponding text in the specification of *Sakamoto. (See* Office Action, p. 7).

As shown in Figs. 1 and 2 of Sakamoto, one of diodes 6 has its cathode connected to resistor R2. None of diodes 6, however, has its cathode or any other terminal connected to ground. Accordingly, Sakamoto fails to teach the claimed "diode group ... connected [to] ground ... and a cathode terminal connected to the ground," as recited in amended claim 1.

In view of the above-described deficiencies of *Beeteson, Nonomura, Sakamoto*, and Nishioka, claim 1 is allowable over the applied references, and claims 5, 6, and 8 are allowable at least due to their dependence from claim 1.

Moreover, Applicants advise that an advantage of their claimed invention is that the voltage level for driving a liquid crystal is not effected by a change in the voltage level of the input power supply and, thus, remains unchanged, even when the voltage level of the input power supply changes. (*Specification,* p. 9, lines 6-12).

In *Sakamoto*, however, the output voltage Ve in Figs. 1 and 2 is determined in accordance with equation 2, which is a function of power supply Vcc. *Sakamoto,* col. 3, lines 1-5. Thus, *Sakamoto* cannot achieve an output voltage that does not vary with changes in the input power supply. Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 are thus allowable at least for this additional reason.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and reexamination of this application and the timely allowance of the pending claims.

Please grant any extensions of time required to enter this response and charge any additional required fees to our deposit account 06-0916.

Respectfully submitted,

FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW,
GARRETT & DUNNER, L.L.P.

Dated: August 5, 2005

By: Reg. No. 34,731
for Arthur S. Garrett
Reg. No. 20,338